

HOTCHKISS CO. INC.,  
GRAZING PERMIT  
RENEWAL

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
OR-05-025-018

Bureau of Land Management  
Burns District Office  
28910 Hwy 20 West  
Hines, Oregon 97738

January 26, 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction: Purpose of and Need for Action.....	1
Chapter II. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action .....	2
A. Description of the Proposed Action.....	2
B. No Action Alternative.....	2
Chapter III. Description of the Affected Environment .....	2
Chapter IV. Environmental Consequences .....	3
A. Proposed Action.....	3
1. Anticipated Impacts .....	3
2. Cumulative Impacts .....	3
Chapter V. Persons and Agencies Consulted.....	3
Chapter VI. Participating Staff .....	3

HOTCHKISS CO. INC. GRAZING PERMIT RENEWAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
OR-05-025-018

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

Grazing permittees who graze their livestock on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management shall have grazing permits issued to them under the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4130.2(a)). Grazing permits shall be issued for a term of 10 years unless there is some reason which requires a term of less than 10 years under the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4130.2(d)). In this case, the Hotchkiss Co. Inc. grazing permit will be issued for a period of 10 years.

The Three Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) of 1992, identified land that was available for livestock grazing. The land in the Gouldin (#7025), Peabody (#7047), Skull Creek (#7030), Sawtooth-MNF (#7051), Juniper Ridge (#7016), Hotchkiss Individual (#7032), Double O (#7056), and Hay Creek (#7031) Allotments, which are within the Hotchkiss Co. Inc., grazing permit meet the criteria set forth in the Three Rivers RMP under GM 1.4, Page 2-37 (refer to Vicinity Maps A and Allotment Maps B). This action is also in conformance with applicable Tribal, State, and County laws, regulations, and Land Use Plans. (This analysis is tiered to the Three Rivers RMP and incorporates by reference, the information and analysis contained within the RMP.)

There are currently native, T&E, and locally important species (i.e., sage-grouse, redband trout, Malheur mottled sculpin, bald eagle), and/or its habitat present in the allotments under this term permit. The current grazing systems address the needs of these species and, therefore, should not be in conflict with their needs.

An analysis of the grazing systems used on the allotments listed above for compliance with the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (S&Gs) have been completed. Five of the above-mentioned allotments are meeting standards under current management practices. Three of the above-mentioned allotments did not meet standards for reasons other than livestock as causal factors. The following list explains if standards were met and what indicators were used in the decision.

- Gouldin (#7025): S&Gs completed in March 2000. Standard not met for Watershed Function – Uplands, due to Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use. Livestock was not a significant factor.
- Peabody (#7047): S&Gs completed in January 2002. Standards met.
- Skull Creek (#7030): S&Gs completed in March 2004. Standards not met for water quality and native, T&E, and locally important species, due to past livestock grazing practices. System changed 10 years ago. Livestock currently not a significant factor.
- Sawtooth-MNF (#7051): S&Gs completed in February 1998. Standards met.

- Juniper Ridge (#7016): S&Gs completed in March 2000. Standards met.
- Hotchkiss Individual (#7032): S&Gs completed in August 1999. Standards met.
- Double O (#7056): S&Gs completed in September 2003. Standards met.
- Hay Creek (#7031): S&Gs completed in March 2004. Standard not met for water quality (temperature), due to past livestock grazing practices. Livestock currently not a significant factor.

## CHAPTER II: ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

### A. Description of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to issue to the current permittee (Hotchkiss Co. Inc.), a term livestock grazing permit to graze livestock on public land for a period of 10 years. The new term permit would be issued with the same terms and conditions as the expiring permit. This would continue the existing grazing management and would be the same as a no action alternative. Therefore, both alternatives will be analyzed under the proposed action. There has been monitoring of the effects of the current livestock grazing system in place within these allotments for a number of years. The data analyzed indicates that allotment objectives are currently being met.

### B. No Action Alternative

The proposed action would continue current terms and conditions. Monitoring has shown that allotment resource objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health are being met, or if not met, livestock grazing is not a causal factor. Therefore, while a "No Grazing Alternative" has been considered, for the above reasons this alternative will not be addressed further in this document.

## CHAPTER III: DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The following critical elements of the human environment have been analyzed in the Three Rivers RMP/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), are not known to be present, or would not be affected by the proposed action or alternative: Prime or Unique Farmlands, Floodplains, Hazardous Materials, Research Natural Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas, Air Quality, Water Quality, Cultural Heritage, American Indian Religious Concerns, Noxious Weeds, Paleontology, Special Status Fauna, and Special Status Flora.

The following critical elements have been recently established and were not addressed as such in the Three Rivers RMP/EIS.

Migratory Birds: Some migratory birds are known to use the project area for nesting, foraging, and resting as they pass through on their yearly migrations.

Environmental Justice: There are no economically disadvantaged or minority populations present within the project area who would be disproportionately affected by enactment of the proposed action.

## CHAPTER IV: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### A. Proposed Action

#### 1. Anticipated Impacts

Grazing use for Hotchkiss Co. Inc., would be authorized under a new term grazing permit. The level and timing of use by livestock in the allotments would not change from what was authorized at the time the Three Rivers RMP was adopted.

- a. Migratory Birds: There would be no known effect on migratory birds by the issuing of a livestock grazing permit.
- b. Environmental Justice: There are no economically disadvantaged or minority populations which would be disproportionately affected by issuance of a livestock grazing permit.

#### 2. Cumulative Impacts

There are no known cumulative impacts, either positive or negative, that would occur if a grazing permit is issued.

## CHAPTER V: PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Hotchkiss Co. Inc., c/o Mark and Susan Doverspike, Grazing Permittees

## CHAPTER VI: PARTICIPATING STAFF

Bill Andersen, District Range Management Specialist  
Lindsay Aschim, Fishery Biologist  
Jim Buchanan, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist  
Gary Foulkes, District Planning/Environmental Coordinator  
Terri Geisler, Geologist  
Doug Linn, Botanist  
Fred McDonald, Recreation  
Nick Miller, Wildlife Biologist  
Lisa Norfolk, Range Management Specialist, Lead Preparer  
Lesley Richman, Weed Specialist  
Scott Thomas, Archaeologist